3

G. R. S. 58
Previous references.

File No. 53 of 02

190 2-3

Serial Nos. 1—4

(S. R.)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—4

Part B. for September 07

SUBJECT.

Inamdar's claim to the toddy revenue of the Kayamputta Hullaloo Village, Bangal- Taluk.

---

(1) From the Excise Commr No. 4638/271 of 10.2.0 (D. 0020).

Submits the records of enquiry relating to the toddy revenue of the Kayamputta Hullalu Villa and states that he concurring with the Inves officer, holds that the Kayamputta is not entitled to the revenue from toddy, but 1/5 of th grave rent is payable to him

(2) To the Excise Commr No 28 of 18.7.03

Returns the [illegible] & points out that th Statement of the Inamdar is neither date nor attested & that the calculation of the amou due, made by the Investigating Officer is incorrec

3. From the Excise Comm^{r}: No. 936 & 29.7.07.

Rebuts the record and states that the Inam groves in the Bangalore Taluk appear to have been grouped & sold and consequently the amount payable to the Inamdar is not definitely known and that he is entitled to only $\frac{1}{5}$ of the Government for the years 1892—93 to 1896-7.

4. To the Excise Comm^{r} & Comptroller No. 71 (067-8 & 29.7.07.

Disallows claim of the Inamdars.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

(REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS).

~~800~~ 53-02

(Full Office Note.)

‡ **Subject.** Grove Cowie's letter no 4638 of 271 of 10-13". Relety of B

Ramadevi's claim to the toddy revenue of the Kanyam-gutlee Hullaloo village, Bangalore Taluk

* **Note.** The village has only a date grove but no toddy shop. It stood in the name of one Mallikarjuna Mestry. No mention of toddy is made either in the Inam title deed or the village to the Mestry or in the Inam Title deed. No shop or grove existed then when the claim was enquired into in July 1894. The claimant Ramadevi the toddy revenue stating that he planted up the trees after he came in possession of it & that he has been enjoying the revenue ever since the trees began to yield. He is exempted from the Contractor's fees to take from the trees

‡ 1. No. and date of latest letter or paper.
2. Catch words to show nature of subject.
3. Subject to be in red and body of note in black ink.

* 1. Statement of case in narrative form in regular sequence of subject matter or date.
2. Opinions to be stated only as supported by precedents, or general rules which should always be quoted.
3. Serial numbers in file, &c., to be always stated.
4. Dates of important documents referred should be given.
5. Write on both sides, leaving the same side as margin.

Interest holder is only
a Trustee. He is in
possession of the
papers with him that
relate to the original holder
who produced at the first
sequence. His is not
affected by the investigation
of the amount due to
the insured for each
year is interest. As
he is induced local
Courts also is due
to go to Court

The investigation of
has ceased that yet
16 & 17 also apply to this
Case. But the Court
Says nothing about this
in his letter.

- The claim is disallowed
by the investigation of the Court
Draft ruled for defendant

Tgw
15/7/03

Serial No.

2 To the Excise Comr
No 28 of 18/7/07
Returns the record & points out that the statement of the Dravidian is neither dated nor attested & that the calculation of the amount due under the investigation sheet is incorrect

3 From the Excise Comr
No 936 of 29/7/07
Returns the record and states that the Dravidians in the Bangalore Taluk appear to have been grouped & sold & consequently the amount payable to the Dravidian is not definitely known and that he is entitled only to ½ of the Shore rent for the years 1892-93 to 1896-97
If it is true that the Dravidians in the whole Taluk were grouped together & sold it is not clear how the revenue collected during each of the years (1892-93 to 1896-97) is calculated & entered in the Collectors

GPB—50,000—25.2.07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 53 of 1902

Serial No.

Memo of investigation and the statement upon which Mr B. K. Veeraraghavan has ordered the payment of advance to the Maniadar. It is also not clear how the correct account can hereafter be obtained if no detailed account is maintained in respect of each Inam village. Rs 95 seem to have been advanced to the Maniadar while he is not entitled to this much. No doubt the Maniadar is not entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy

Submitted for orders

Rice
9.8.07

The question of claim may now be considered. The question of refund. The claim has been disallowed by all the Officers & the decision is correct and a draft may be put up accordingly. The case comes under rule 4. The trees in the village are reserved, not reported, leased by Govt & claim disallowed and so nothing

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—25-2-07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S.R. File No. 53 of 1902

Serial No.

is due to the Inamdar for the period of the preliminary settlement & since the introduction of the latter system in its entirety the Inamdar must have himself being leasing the lands —

The amount to be refunded for the period of the farming system is stated to be under correspondence and when the refund bills — submitted for sanction the correctness of the amt recommended for refund may be considered.

The question of the claim itself is independent and does not in its merits —

6.8.07

Submitted draft disallowing the claim

1880/1078 Genl Secy 27.8.07

Issued

To: The Excise Comr

Comptroller

no. JE-1067-8/29.9.07

disallowing the claim of the Inamdars

4

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—25-2-07

Excise Commissioner's Office,

Bangalore, dated 10th/13th February 1903

No. 4638/271 Enc 1 file

From,

The Excise Commissioner,
in Mysore.

To.

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In submitting herewith the record of enquiry relating to the Toddy Revenue of Kayamguttu Hullalu village, Bangalore taluk, I have the honor to state that I concur in the investigating officer's finding that the Kayamguttadar is not entitled to Excise Revenue from Toddy. Accordingly only 1/5 of the rent of the "Grove Farm" is payable to him under Rule 4 in Government Proceedings. No. 2074-83/R.F. 166-92, dated 2nd August 1901.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

S. Venkatarangayya

for Excise Commissioner,
in Mysore.

E. 2880

9020

1903

FROM 17-2-1903 Gen 53-28.(1)

The Excise Commissioner

in Mysore.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of

H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Depts.

Dated 10th } February 1903

Despatched 13 }

Received

General No. 4638

No. 271

Enclosure No. 1 file

Subject.

Submits the record of enquiry relating to the toddy Revenue of Kayanna-gutta Hullalu village, Bangalore Taluk.

Mysore Court
Cecil & Rev. Depts

(2) **Office Draft.** (Docket.) (2)

~~Mysore Dewan's Office,~~
Secret Branch.

To The Deputy Commr
in Mysore

Date of passing the draft 17/7/03.
Date of despatch 18/7/03

Regd. No. 28
File No. & date (if any) Ex 716-04

No. of Encls. 1 Ple. 53 on

His letter No. 4638/271 of 13th Feby 1903

Requesting
the free of record
relating to the Inam-
dar's claim to the
Coddy reserve of the
Kanyanentha Hullaloo
village Bangalore
Taluk, received
with the above
has the honor to
observe that the
statement of the
Inamdar present
holder of the village
is neither dated nor
attested by the in-

Undertaking the C. Officer

The Calculation of (made by him

the amount due to

the investigation for

each organ needs

to be inquired, local

Cess also being included

in it — The Cess

Commr. when ~~in such~~ does not state

~~as to the applicability~~

~~or otherwise of rules~~ whether

16 & 17 are applicable to this case —

through the investi

gating Officer has

recorded that ~~there~~ they

~~rules~~ apply —

2) The amount due

to the investigation

under each of the

rules applicable

should be distinctly

shown in the Calculation and it should also

be stated whether Rule 16 & 17 applies to the case

as both of them cannot apply at the same time to the same

group of Estates B.O

Section 17(1)

16/7/03

16/7/03

II 4.87

~~S R 46 07 & 08~~ 0438

S R. 53 & 02-03 & (3) SR 63

No. 936 1/pic

OFFICE OF THE EXCISE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

DATED BANGALORE, 29th July 1907

From

H.H.Sparkes, Esquire,

Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

C.S.Balasundram Iyer, Esquire, B.A.,
Offg. Secretary to the Govt. of H.H. the
Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl & Rev. Departments, Bangalore.

SIR,

Adverting to your docket No.28/Ex.F.16-01, dated 18th July 1907 1903 regarding the Inamdar's claim to the Excise revenue from toddy of Kayamgutha Hullalu village in the Bangalore Taluk, I have the honor to submit the records of enquiry received under cover of docket No.A17, dated 20th July 1907 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, and to state that the statement of the present holder of the village has been dated and attested by the investigating officer.

2. The Inam groves in the Bangalore Taluk appear to have been grouped and sold. Consequently the amount payable to the Inamdar in question is not definitely known. The subject is under correspondence with the Deputy Commissioner and the amount will be checked and verified when submitting the refund bill on receipt of Government orders as to the right of the Inamdar.

3. Under the farming system, the Inamdar is entitled only to 1/5th of the grove-rent for the years 1892-93 to 1896-97. Under the preliminary Tree-tax system which was in force in the year 1897-98, the "Grove Farm" in this alienated village was not sold or leased by Government, the Proprietor being left to lease it to toddy vend farmers or shop-keepers at such rates of tree rent as might

might be privately settled by themselves. Under the tree-tax system the Inamdar is at liberty to lease his trees to the licensees of shops for the manufacture of toddy, for such tree rent as may be settled between himself and the licensees of shops.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

H H Lyon

Excise Commissioner

in Mysore.